

## A PETITION TO THE EPIMELETES DOROTHEOS IN TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

Gert Baetens (K.U.Leuven, PhD fellow Research Foundation Flanders)\*

A reassessment and re-edition of the Petrie papyri has been a long-time desideratum.<sup>1</sup> Some progress has been made, but hundreds of fragments remain unpublished and the editio princeps has become even more obsolete in the meantime.<sup>2</sup> The papyrus published here, Trinity College inv. Pap. Gr. folder 127, consists of six fragments, joined by Smyly and Clarysse on the basis of the handwriting and the fine quality of the papyrus. The document records a petition (hypomnema) to the epimeletes Dorotheos and can be dated to the reign of Epiphanes (cf. *infra*).

Ptolemaic epimeletai were financial officials, but their precise function is unclear.<sup>3</sup> Their responsibilities resemble those of *oikonomoi* and ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων. The ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων seem to have superseded for the greatest part both the *oikonomoi* and epimeletai towards the end of the second century, but the relationship between the *oikonomoi* and epimeletai is difficult to determine.<sup>4</sup> They appear together in several papyri and there is no clear distinction between their tasks and rank, at least not if all documents are taken in account.<sup>5</sup>

The chronology of the institution of the office is also controversial. According to Clarysse and Hauben no epimeletes is attested before the reign of Philopator.<sup>6</sup> McGing cites two documents mentioning an epimeletes that may point to an earlier institution of the office, but concedes that their dating is doubtful.<sup>7</sup> *P. Grad.* 7 (= *SB* III 6280) was initially dated in the reign of Euergetes, but this has been corrected to the reign of Philopator.<sup>8</sup> The dating of the second document, *P. Bad.* II 13 (= *SB* VIII 9800a), recording a letter to the dioiketes Phoinix, is more complex.<sup>9</sup> McGing suggests a mid third century date on the basis of palaeography, though nothing excludes the late third century.<sup>10</sup> Two other letters to Phoinix have been preserved (*P. Hib.* II 244 and *P. Köln* XI 438). The last text belongs to the Theomnestos dossier, containing another papyrus mentioning the epimeletes Agathokles (*P. Köln* XI 448). The latter is also mentioned in *P. Strasb.* II 103 and 104, which belong to the Hermias dossier, which is in turn closely linked to the Harmachis file. Falivene situates all these documents in the reign of Euergetes instead of Philopator (the traditional date) on the basis of the following arguments:<sup>11</sup>

---

\* I wish to express my gratitude to Willy Clarysse and Brian McGing for their indispensable support and comments.

<sup>1</sup> Van 't Dack (1972).

<sup>2</sup> New editions: Clarysse (1991); *P. Count* 12-21; Van Beek (forthcoming).

<sup>3</sup> For an overview of the evidence: McGing (2002) 51-64.

<sup>4</sup> For the ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων: Falivene (1991) 222; McGing (2002) 52; Salmenkivi (2003) 124.

<sup>5</sup> In isolated papyri, distinctions can sometimes be made: Falivene (2012) 221-222; McGing (2002) 54-55.

<sup>6</sup> Clarysse & Hauben (1991) 51-53.

<sup>7</sup> McGing (2002) 52.

<sup>8</sup> Armoni e.a. (2006) 195.

<sup>9</sup> Falivene (2012).

<sup>10</sup> McGing (2002) 52.

<sup>11</sup> Falivene (2012).

1. *P. Hib.* II 244 is dated by Turner, the editor, to late Philadelphos or early Euergetes, on the basis of its handwriting.<sup>12</sup> As the text mentions a ninth year, a date under Euergetes does indeed seem plausible. If the ninth year is attributed to the reign of Philopator, this is problematic for the dioiketes Phoinix, since Theogenes is attested as dioiketes for that year. Armoni e.a. argue that Phoinix might have been a hypodioiketes or a regional dioiketes.<sup>13</sup> But in *P. Bad.* II 13 “Phoinix is expected to act between, and above two different and distant districts (Saïtes and Herakleopolites), precisely as a dioiketes should do”.<sup>14</sup>
2. Falivene agrees with Clarysse and Lanciers that the silver monetary standard is used in the Hermias file (contra Reekmans, who argues for the bronze standard), but according to her this would make a dating under Euergetes more plausible.<sup>15</sup>
3. The eighth year mentioned in *P. Strasb.* II 562 and 563 (Harmachis file) can be situated in the reign of Euergetes, as at this time Agathokleia may have been old enough to own ships.<sup>16</sup>
4. Several documents from these files suggest extraordinary circumstances: armed rebels (*P. Köln* XI 441), a strike (*P. Strasb.* II 95), distributions to soldiers (*P. Strasb.* II 95) and a request of all draught-animals from a certain area (*P. Strasb.* II 93). This is linked by Falivene to the aftermath of the Third Syrian War of 261-241 BC.<sup>17</sup>

There are, however, several objections against each of these arguments in favor of the traditional date, which in our view should be maintained:

1. In *P. Bad.* II 13 Phoinix is asked to order the epimeletes of the Saïte nome to provide freighters to the Herakleopolite nome. It does not seem improbable that one would write to the hypodioiketes in the Saïte area on this occasion. Not all business involving distinct nomes had to be conducted through the central dioiketes.
2. The Hermias file records the payment of soldiers in a twelfth year. Heichelheim situates these documents under Euergetes, but gives no motivation for this.<sup>18</sup> In fact, the use of the silver standard does not contradict a traditional dating under Philopator. The chronology of the monetary change under Philopator is problematic, but the twelfth year of Philopator (211/210 BC) seems to have been the transitory year, in which low prices in silver money and high prices in bronze money were used side by side.<sup>19</sup>
3. Agathokleia was certainly old enough to be in control of Philopator and his kingdom when Euergetes died (222 BC).<sup>20</sup> But was she old enough to own ships eighteen years earlier (year 9 mentioned in *P. Strasb.* II 562 and 563)? Falivene argues that Agathokleia was older than her brother Agathokles, because he is said to have been Philopator’s *eromenos* (Aristoph., *Thesm.* 1062). She also mentions another source, however, in which Agathokles is said to have been his *hetairos*, a more adult role (Athen. 6.251e). Next, it seems far-fetched that ὁ Φιλοπάτωρ ὁ τῆς Ἀγαθοκλείας (Strab. 17.1.11) should be translated ‘Philopator, the son of Agathokleia’ to insinuate that Agathokleia was old enough to be Philopator’s mother. An interpretation as ‘the lover of Agathokleia’ or even more simply ‘the one of Agathokleia’ seems more likely.

<sup>12</sup> Turner (1955) II 155.

<sup>13</sup> Armoni e.a. (2007) 83-84. Cf. Thomas (1978).

<sup>14</sup> Falivene (2012) 222.

<sup>15</sup> Clarysse & Lanciers (1989); Falivene (2012) 225; Reekmans (1948) 28.

<sup>16</sup> Falivene (2012) 224. For Agathokleia, daughter of Oinante of Samos and mistress of Philopator: Hauben (1975).

<sup>17</sup> Falivene (2012) 225.

<sup>18</sup> Heichelheim (1930) 26.

<sup>19</sup> Clarysse & Fischer-Bovet (2012); Clarysse & Lanciers (1989).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Falivene (2012) 224.

Finally, even if Agathokleia was old enough in 240/239 BC to own ships, this does not exclude that she only came in the possession of these ships at a later age, in the ninth year of Philopator (214-213 BC).

4. The extraordinary circumstances can be attributed to the aftermath of the Fourth Syrian War (221-217 BC) as well. Philopator's reign in fact marked the beginning of a long period of economic crisis and indigenous unrest.<sup>21</sup>

The petition to the epimeletes published here was handed in by the village scribe of Tanis. Due to the fragmentary character of the text, it is very difficult to reconstruct what exactly happened. Apparently the village scribe was responsible for a grain shipment in 207/206 BC (cf. *infra* for date) and was blamed because the shipment was not delivered as planned. The men who transported the load (κοντωτίται) were involved in these problems. In this petition, the village scribe asks the epimeletes to write a letter to an unnamed chief of the police, who may perhaps have blocked the shipment.

The main text is written against the fibers on the recto (plate 1). On the basis of line 12, we can conclude that each line contained 50 to 60 characters (cf. *infra*). Probably the first line of the lower fragment of the recto (βουλ[ο]μέγων) is part of the last line of the upper fragments (line 9). The dot behind βουλ[ο]μέγων seems to be part of the tau of [ἀπο]μετρήσαι and the proposed supplement would fit. The second smallest fragment cannot be situated precisely, but clearly belongs to the main text. The handwriting of the main text (m 1) is neat and suggests a date in the late third (broad π and τ, respect for upper line) or early second century (large and curved μ, anorganic connecting strokes). Another distinctive feature are the little dots that appear at the beginning of several words (ἐμοῦ, ἐκτεθέντος, Ἀνδρονίκου, ἀρχιφυλακίτη, λῦσαι). The docket on the verso (plate 2) is written in a different hand (m 2), trained but more cursive. The y-shaped τ fits a late third to early second century dating. The first line of the recto, stating the date, was clearly added to the main text, but cannot be attributed with certainty to the writer of the main text or the docket (so possibly a third hand: m 3).

Another petition (hypomnema) to an epimeletes named Dorotheos was submitted by Petosiris, a tanner from Krokodilon polis (*P. Petrie* II 32.1 = *P. Petrie* III 36 d). In this document too, an added first line states the date. Moreover, both petitions originate from Petrie's excavations in Gurob and show the same structure (receiver - sender - genitive absolute at the beginning, appeal to Dorotheos' φιλάνθρωπία in future perfect tense at the end). In the *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* (I 939 = VIII 939) the two references are attributed to the same person; this seems correct.

Trinity College inv. Pap. Gr. folder 127

Date: August 27, 202 BC

Measurements: 8.8 x 10.5 cm (upper left part), 7 x 8 cm (upper right part), 22 x 7 cm (lower part), 4 x 5.5 cm (middle fragment), 1.5 x 2.7 cm (lower left fragment)

Recto:

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Veisse (2004).

1 m 3 γέγρ(απται) γρ(αφή) (ἔτους) γ Ἐπειφ κγ.  
 2 m 1 Δωροθέωι ἐπι[μελητῇι παρὰ NN κωμογραμμα]τέως Τάνεως.  
 3 Ἐμοῦ ἐκτεθέ[ντος ἐ]ργαστήριον  
 4 τοῦ ις (ἔτους) πυρ[οῦ ἀρτάβας x ] κεχειρογράφη-  
 5 κα ἀπομετρ[ήσαι ] τῇν δὲ κριθὴν  
 6 τοῖς κοντωτ[ίταις γεγ]ονότος ὑπὸ  
 7 Ἀνδρονίκου τ[οῦ ]του τῶν Κοιτῶν  
 8 παρέδωκαν [ NN τῶ]ι ἀρχιφυλακίτη.  
 9 Ἡμῶν δὲ [ ] . βουλ[ο]μένων [ἀπο]μετρήσαι  
 10 [ ] . . [ ] καὶ τοῖς κ[οντ]ω<τί>ταις καθότι τετάγμεθα  
 11 [ ] -πα]τρος ὁ ἀρχιφυλα[κί]της τῆς κώμης ἐὰμ μὴ αὐτῶι γράψ[ηις]  
 12 [Ἀξιουμέν σε ἐάν] σοι φαίνεται σ[υν]τάξει γράψαι λῦσαι τὸν πυρὸ[ν π]αρὰ  
 13 [ Τούτου γὰρ] γενομένου ἐσ[ό]μεθα τῆς παρὰ σοῦ φιλανθ[ρ]ωπίας  
 14 [τ]ετ[ευχότες.] Ἐυτύχει.

Verso:

15 m 2 [ ] . [ ] ... [ ] ...ος ὁ παρὰ βα(σιλικοῦ) γρα(μματέως) ἐπακολουθήσας  
 τὸ ις (ἔτος) μετρήσε[ι]ν ἕως Ἐπειφ α  
 16 [ ] α . γγ ..... [ ] ... [ ] . ε . κεχειρογράφηκεν τοῖς γραμματεῦσιν.

Fragment:

1 m 1 [ ... ἐπιστ]ολῆς . [ ... ]  
 2 [ ... ] . . α [ ... ]  
 3 [ ... ] καθότι . [ ... ]

Recto: (m 3) *Document written in year 3, Epeiph 23. (m 1) To Dorotheos, epimeletes, from NN, village scribe of Tanis. I have been posted ... ergasterion ... in year 16 for x artabas of wheat ... I have made a written oath to the scribes that I have measured ... the barley to the kontotitai ... by Andronikos ... of Koitai ... they have given ... to the chief of the police. We ... wanting to measure ... and to the kontotitai, as we have been ordered ... -patros, the chief of the police of the village, if you don't write to him. I ask you, therefore, if it seems good to you, to order a letter to be written to release the wheat from ... For when this is accomplished, we will have obtained your benevolence. Farewell.*

Verso: (m 2) *... -os, the assistant of the royal scribe has agreed to deliver the sixteenth year before Epeiph 1 ... has made a written oath to the scribes.*

1 This line was added in Dorotheos' office on Epeiph 23 of year 3. There are no parallels for the abbreviation γεγρ γρ; the supplement is only tentative. Line 4 and 15 mention an earlier sixteenth year, in which some trouble has occurred. As the handwriting suggests a late third or early second century dating, the sixteenth and third year have to be situated either in the reigns of Euergetes and Philopator, or those of Philopator and Epiphanes or Epiphanes and Philometor. If one situates the occurrence of year 16 under Euergetes or Epiphanes, who ruled for 26 and 25 years respectively, the petition would have been written more than ten years after the first events. If the two events are attributed to the sixteenth year of the reign of Philopator (207/206 BC)

and the third year of the reign of Epiphanes (August 27, 202 BC, a year earlier than suggested in *Pros. Ptol.* VIII 939), this leaves a gap of only five or four years between them. Another petition to Dorotheos (*P. Petrie* II 32.1 = *P. Petrie* III 36 d) reached his office on Mesore 17 of year 8. On the basis of the huge sums of bronze money that appear in the text, the petition has previously been situated under Epiphanes or Philometor.<sup>22</sup> A dating under Epiphanes (September 19, 197 BC) seems most plausible on the basis of this new petition. Both documents were, therefore, written somewhat later than the bulk of the Petrie papyri.

- 2 Given the similarities between this petition and *P. Petrie* II 32.1 (= *P. Petrie* III 36 d) mentioned above, it is clear that this document was addressed to the epimeletes (ἐπιμελητῇ) of the Arsinoite nome, Dorotheos, who was in office during Epiphanes' reign as argued above. Several texts associate epimeletai to the grain supply and here also the petitioner writes to Dorotheos about problems arising from a faulty grain shipment.<sup>23</sup> Tanis is a village (*kome*) in the meris of Herakleides, not far from Philadelphiea.<sup>24</sup>
- 3-4 *P. Tebt.* III 1.774, another petition from the early second century BC containing a passive form of ἐκτίθημι with a personal subject (Ammonios, the petitioner), furnishes a parallel for ἐμοῦ ἐκτεθέντος. Line 21-23 of this text read as follows:

καὶ ἐκτίθεμαι πυρῶν ἄρ(τ.) Αφ καὶ με[τὰ]  
 Ἡλιοδώρου τὸ αὐτὸ ἐργαστήριον τὸ ιζ [(ἔτος) καὶ]  
 ἐκτίθεμαι πυρῶν ἄ[ρ(τ.)] τ

Since traditional translations of ἐκτίθημι, such as 'to explain' or 'to account for' do not satisfy in this case, the editors translate this verb as a passive form in its most basic meaning, 'to publish' or 'to post': "and I am posted for 1500 artabas of wheat, and with Heliodoros of the same store (= the ergasterion of Boubastos) for the seventeenth year, I have been posted for 300 artabas of wheat".<sup>25</sup> This would mean that the amounts of wheat for which Ammonios (and in the second case also Heliodoros) was responsible were made public by the authorities. While the exact meaning of this expression remains uncertain, the similarities with the petition to Dorotheos are striking. The komogrammateus of Tanis, also operating from an ergasterion, was 'posted' for a certain amount of wheat as well, in the sixteenth year of Philopator, but the wheat was not delivered as planned. On the basis of this parallelism πυρ[οῦ] may be supplemented on line 4, followed by ἀρτάβας, possibly abbreviated.

The location of the ergasterion in question is lost in the lacuna. Duttonhöfer argues that the Ptolemaic ergasteria in the Arsinoite nome served as central offices controlling multiple thesauroi in a certain region. She identifies four ergasteria in the Herakleides meris: in Boubastos, in the Exo Topoi, in Philadelphiea and in the area of Philopator

<sup>22</sup> Cadell & Le Rider (1997) 45-46; Mahaffy & Smyly (1905) 78; *Pros. Ptol.* I 939, V 12934.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. McGing (2002) 61-62.

<sup>24</sup> Monson (2012) 2-3; Uytterhoeven (2003).

<sup>25</sup> Hunt & Smyly (1933) 205.

and Soknopaiou Nesos.<sup>26</sup> Clarysse and Müller add Bakchias to the list of settlements with an ergasterion in the Herakleides meris. They also criticize Duttonhöfer's interpretation and distinguish between ergasteria as bookkeeping facilities and thesauroi as storage facilities. This explains why ergasteria are attested in smaller settlements as well.<sup>27</sup> Recently, Fati has put forward that the ergasterion of Boubastos and that of the Exo Topoi are in fact one and the same office, in the line of Duttonhöfer's hypothesis of central ergasteria coordinating multiple thesauroi.<sup>28</sup> The ergasterion referred to in our petition was probably situated near Tanis, as the village scribe was involved in its activities. Tanis never appears among the Exo Topoi in the papyrological record; the village rather seems to have been situated right outside the borders of this administrative area. This leaves open two possibilities: either Tanis possessed an ergasterion of its own, previously unattested and fitting into Clarysse's and Müller's hypothesis of ergasteria in more modest localities, or the text refers to the known ergasterion of Philadelphieia, which was situated nearby. In the Roman period, grain from Tanis was delivered to the sitologoi in Philadelphieia.<sup>29</sup> And the lacuna on line 3 leaves ample space for τὸ περὶ Φιλαδέλφειαν ἐργαστήριον.

- 6 The text provides a rare attestation of the word κοντωτίτης. This term has been interpreted traditionally as a man pushing a punt (κοντωτόν) with a pole (κοντός) against the river bed.<sup>30</sup> Diodoros states that these ships were used to navigate the Tigris.<sup>31</sup> According to Appian the Ptolemaic war fleet included 2000 κοντωτά.<sup>32</sup> It is unlikely, however, that small vessels, pushed forward with poles, would be used to navigate deep waters and wage war. Moreover, *P. Hib.* I 39 records a *royal* κοντωτόν carrying grain. As κοντωτά are identified with punts solely on etymological basis, it seems more plausible in respect to the available sources that, at least from the Ptolemaic period, κοντωτά were vessels of a more considerable size.

*P. Oxy.* III 636 provides a good parallel for γεγονότος ὑπό.<sup>33</sup>

- 7 At the end of the line the place-name Koitai can be read. This toponym was used to refer to two adjacent villages in the meris of Herakleides: Δίννεως Κοίτη and Ὀννιτῶν Κοίτη. Their precise location is unclear: they must have been situated in the southern or north-eastern part of the district, while Tanis was located on the eastern border of the Herakleides meris. Both villages shared the same komogrammateus, but were largely independent from each other in other respects, as most texts that refer to Δίννεως Κοίτη and Ὀννιτῶν Κοίτη do not mention them together.<sup>34</sup> The petition to Dorotheos offers a new clue: probably the name of the village was preceded by the name and title of an official. This must have been another official than the

<sup>26</sup> Duttonhöfer (1993). The Exo Topoi were a distinct administrative area at the entrance and eastern border of the Fayum: cf. Uytterhoeven (2009) 304-309.

<sup>27</sup> Clarysse & Müller (2004).

<sup>28</sup> Fati (2012).

<sup>29</sup> Hagedorn (2012).

<sup>30</sup> Most recently Khalil (2012) 43.

<sup>31</sup> Diod. 19.12.

<sup>32</sup> App., *Prooem.* 10.

<sup>33</sup> Transcribed in *Stud. Pal.* IV, p.114-115.

<sup>34</sup> Hoogendijk (2007) 132-134.

komogrammateus (...]του), which would suggest a stronger administrative unity between both villages than recognised so far.

Andronikos cannot be identified with any known individual. Due to the large lacuna, it is unsure whether he is the official of Koitai referred to.

- 8 The verb could be either παρέδωκα (with the nu initiating the following word) or παρέδωκαν. A third person plural form, possibly referring to the *kontotitai*, seems most plausible, as we would rather expect an article after the verb than a word starting with a nu.
- 9 A new sentence starts with a first person plural pronoun. On line 10 and 13 verbs in first person plural appear. It seems unlikely that this form actually refers to a group of people, as in that case the text would start with one petitioner and end with multiple petitioners. It seems more plausible that the village scribe refers to himself alternately in singular or in generalizing plural.<sup>35</sup>
- 10 We cannot exclude that τοῖς κ[οντ]ωταις was a valid spelling variant, since the word is very rare (in addition, see *P. Cair. Zen.* III 59492; *P. Grenf.* I 9; possibly *PSI* VI 551). But as we have no parallel sources, it is more plausible to correct τοῖς κ[οντ]ω<τί>ταις on this line and supplement τοῖς κοντωτ[ίταις] on line 6.
- 11 The chief of the police in question (*Pros. Ptol.* VIII 4608 b) is not attested elsewhere and cannot even be identified with certainty with the chief mentioned on line 8. Probably his name ends with - πατρος, for other names with - τρος are very rare. Before this nominative form a verb is expected. The assimilation of ἐάν to ἐάμ is typical of the third century BC.<sup>36</sup>
- 12 These concluding formulae are typical of Ptolemaic petitions to kings or high officials.<sup>37</sup> The proposed supplement seems plausible considering the measurements: for this line 22 cm of papyrus has been preserved, with 41 characters and a 2 cm margin. This makes a rough average of 0,5 cm for each individual character. As papyrus rolls were normally 30 cm tall, the lost part must have measured 8 cm. Subtracting a 2 cm margin, this leaves room for about 12 characters. Still, some less attested alternatives for the first supplement are possible. Sometimes σε or σοι were omitted from the formula and/or οὖν added. Similar constructions with δεῖν were also used. Be that as it may, on the basis of this line we can calculate that each line contained 50 to 60 characters. The object of λῦσαι has to be a short male accusative noun with a rho. πυρόν seems to be the only plausible option: perhaps Dorotheos was asked to write a letter to the chief of the police to lift the blockage of a grain shipment. It must be noted however that the traces before the rho are not ideal to make for an upsilon.

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Mayser (1926) 40-42.

<sup>36</sup> Mayser & Schmoll (1970<sup>2</sup>) 204.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Di Bitonto (1968).

- 13 The preposition *παρά* was followed by a personal or place name, perhaps Koitai. It could also have been the beginning of the word *παραχρήμα*. The genitive absolute *τούτου γενομένου* is also recorded without *γάρ*, but we have opted for this supplement on the basis of the other petition to Dorotheos (*P. Petrie* II 32.1 = *P. Petrie* III 36 d) and the ample room in the lacuna.
- 15-16 Unfortunately the verso has been badly preserved. The reading *βα(συλικοῦ) γρα(μματέως)* was suggested by Smyly, in his unpublished notebooks on the inedited Petrie papyri, studied by Vanaverbeke for his licentiate thesis.<sup>38</sup> Unfortunately, we cannot identify this assistant of the royal scribe with another individual from the text. The construction of *ἐπακολουθήσας* with a future infinitive is problematic, but no other reading seems possible. Further there is mention of the delayed grain delivery for the sixteenth year and the written oath, sworn by the village scribe.

#### Cited works:

Armoni e.a. (2006): Charikleia ARMONI, Monika HASITZKA, Patrick SÄNGER & Fritz MITTHOF, 'Bemerkungen zu Papyri XIX <Korr. Tyche>', *Tyche* 21 (2006), p. 195-203.

Armoni e.a. (2007): Charikleia ARMONI, Michael GRONEWALD, Klaus MARESCH, Giuseppina AZZARELLO, Robert DANIEL, Jean-Luc FOURNET, Charlotte LEHMANN, Daniela C. LUFT, John LONDON, Franco MALTOMINI, Fabian REITER & Gesa SCHENKE (2007), *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln). Band 11*, Paderborn 2007.

Cadell & Le Rider (1997): Hélène CADELL & Georges LE RIDER, *Prix du blé et numéraire dans l'Égypte lagide de 305 à 173*, Brussels 1997.

Clarysse (1991): Willy CLARYSSE, *The Petrie Papyri. Second edition (P. Petrie 2). Volume 1, The Wills* (Collectanea Hellenistica 2), Leuven 1991.

Clarysse & Fischer-Bovet (2012): Willy CLARYSSE & Christelle FISCHER-BOVET, 'Silver and bronze standards and the date of P.Heid. VI 383', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und Verwandte Gebiete* 58 (2012), p. 36-42.

Clarysse & Hauben (1991): Willy CLARYSSE & Hans HAUBEN, 'Ten Ptolemaic Granary Receipts from Pyrrheia', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 89 (1991), p. 47-68.

Clarysse & Lanciers (1989): Willy CLARYSSE & Eddy LANCIERS, 'Currency and the dating of demotic and Greek papyri from the Ptolemaic period', *Ancient Society* 20 (1989), p. 117-132.

Clarysse & Müller (2004): Willy CLARYSSE & Katja MÜLLER, 'Tax Grain from Bakchias and Ptolemaic Ergasteria', *Studi di Egittologia e di Papirologia* 1 (2004), p. 53-57.

Di Bitonto (1968): Anna DI BITONTO, 'Le petizioni ai funzionari nel periodo tolemaico. Studio sul formulario', *Aegyptus* 48 (1968), p. 53-107.

Duttenhöfer (1993): Ruth DUTTENHÖFER, 'Die Funktion und Stellung des ἐργαστήριον in der Getreideverwaltung der Ptolemäerzeit', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 98 (1993); p. 253-262.

---

<sup>38</sup> Vanaverbeke (1968) 128.



Falivene (1991): Maria R. FALIVENE, 'Government, Management, Literacy. Aspects of Ptolemaic Administration in the Early Hellenistic Period', *Ancient Society* 22 (1991), p. 203-227.

Falivene (2012): Maria R. FALIVENE, 'On provenances : the case of P.Köln XI 448', in: P. SCHUBERT (ed.), *Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrologie. Genève, 16-21 août 2010*, Geneva 2012, p. 221-228.

Fati (2012): Lorenzo FATI, 'Una sezione d'archivio concernente le attività di sitologoi della meris di Herakleides', in: P. SCHUBERT (ed.), *Actes du 26e Congrès international de papyrologie. Genève, 16-21 août 2010*, Geneva 2012, p. 229-238.

Hagedorn (2012): Dieter HAGEDORN, 'P.Corn. 43 und Harpokration, Stratege des Herakleides-Bezirks des Arsinoites', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 182 (2012), p. 275-277.

Hauben (1975): Hans HAUBEN, 'Agathokleia and her Boats', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 19 (1975), p. 289-291.

Heichelheim (1930): Fritz M. HEICHELHEIM, *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen der Zeit von Alexander bis Augustus* (Beiträge zur Erforschung der wirtschaftlichen Wechsellagen Aufschwung, Krise, Stockung 3), Jena 1930.

Hoogendijk (2007): Francisca A.J. HOOGENDIJK, 'Amtliche Korrespondenz zwischen Dorfschreiber und Eklogistes', in: A.J.B. SIRKS & K.A. WÖRPER (eds.), *Papyri in Memory of P.J. Sijpesteijn (P. Sijp.)*, Chippenham 2007, p. 128-139.

Hunt & Smyly (1933): Arthur S. HUNT & J. Gilbert SMYLY, *The Tebtunis Papyri. Volume III. Part I*, London 1933.

Khalil (2012): Emad KHALIL, 'The *plouion hellenikon* of Roman Egypt: What was Greek about it?', *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan* 19 (2012), p. 39-50.

Mahaffy & Smyly (1905): John P. MAHAFFY & J. Gilbert SMYLY, *The Flinders Petrie Papyri. Volume III*, Dublin 1905.

Mayser (1926): Edwin MAYSER, *Der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschlüssen der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften. Band II 1: Satzlehre. Analytischer Teil*, Berlin 1926.

Mayser & Schmoll (1970), Edwin MAYSER & Hans SCHMOLL, *Der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschlüssen der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften. Band I 1. Laut- und Wortlehre. Einleitung und Lautlehre*, Berlin 1970<sup>2</sup>.

McGing (2002): Brian C. MCGING, 'Illegal Salt in the Lycopolite Nome', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 48 (2002), p. 42-66.

Monson (2012): Andrew MONSON, *Agriculture and Taxation in Early Ptolemaic Egypt: Demotic Land Surveys and Accounts (P. Agri. Dem.)*, Bonn 2012.

Reekmans (1948): Tony REEKMANS, 'Monetary history and the dating of Ptolemaic papyri', in: L. CERFAUX & W. PEREMANS (eds.), *Studia Hellenistica* 5, Leuven 1948, p. 15-43.

Salmenkivi (2003): Erja SALMENKIVI, 'A note on the Ptolemaic ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων', *Arctos: acta philologica fennica* 37 (2003), p. 123-132.

Thomas (1978): J. David THOMAS, 'Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service: the Dioiketes and the Nomarch', in: H. MAEHLER & V.M. STROCKA (eds.), *Das Ptolemäische Ägypten, Akten des internationalen Symposion 27.-29. September in Berlin*, Berlin 1978, p. 187-194.

Turner (1955): Eric G. TURNER, *The Hibeh papyri. Volume II*, London 1955.

Uytterhoeven (2003): Inge UYTTERHOEVEN, 'Tanis (meris of Herakleides)', in: *The K.U.Leuven Fayum Project*, 2003: [http://www.trismegistos.org/fayum/fayum2/2251.php?geo\\_id=2251](http://www.trismegistos.org/fayum/fayum2/2251.php?geo_id=2251).

Uytterhoeven (2009): Inge UYTTERHOEVEN, *Hawara in the Graeco-Roman period: life and death in a Fayum village* (Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta 174), Leuven 2009.

Van Beek (forthcoming): Bart VAN BEEK (forthcoming), *The archive of the engineers Kleon and Theodoros*, Leuven forthcoming.

Van 't Dack (1972): Edmond VAN 'T DACK, 'On a Re-edition of the Petrie Papyri', *Ancient Society* 3 (1972), p. 135-147.

Vanaverbeke (1968): Paul VANAVERBEKE, *Bijdrage tot de studie van de P. Petrie Ined. (Papyri Trinity College Dublin)* (Unpublished licentiate thesis K.U.Leuven), Leuven 1968.